

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the current Office Action and the reference(s) cited therein. Claims 13-14, and 30 are herein amended; Claims 1-12, 15-25, and 28-29 are herein canceled; and Claims 31-35 are herein added. As a result, Claims 13-14 and 30-35 are now pending in this application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview on September 14, 2006. Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed October 10, 2006, describing the substance of the telephone interview and Applicant agrees with the Examiner's description of the substance of the telephone interview.

Rejection of Claims 13-24 under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner has rejected Claims 13-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being drawn to non tangible embodiments. The Examiner has suggested amending "computer-usable medium" in Claim 13 to "readable memory device."

Applicant thanks the Examiner for this suggestion and has amended "computer-usable medium" in Claim 13 to "computer-readable memory device." Applicant believes that this amendment is essentially identical to and complies with the Examiner's suggestion. Claim 14 is dependent on Claim 13 and is, thereby, also amended accordingly. Claims 15 to 24 are herein canceled.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, 18-22, and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, 18-22, and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,892,240 issued to Nakajima ("Nakajima"). Applicant has amended Claims 13 and 14 and canceled Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12, 15-16, 18-22, and 24-25.

Applicant asserts that Claims 13 and 14, as herein amended, are neither anticipated by nor obvious over Nakajima. Nakajima does not teach or suggest "determining, at the client, whether there is content associated with the web page in the local cache" and *if there is content associated with the web page in the local cache*, inserting a unique identifier into the address." Instead Nakajima teaches avoiding a caching service of a HTTP Proxy (620). There is no

teaching or suggestion in Nakajima that either client 610, 640 has the capability of determining whether there is content associated with a web page in the proxy cache. Without this capability, a first client (e.g., client 610) can not know whether a second client (e.g., client 640) has requested a particular web page, causing that web page to be cached in the proxy cache. Because the clients in Nakajima do not know the content of the HTTP proxy cache, under the teachings of Nakajima, the only way a client can ensure that the HTTP proxy's caching service is avoided is to *always* "add a temporary unique character string to URL in an upstream HTTP header." That is, Nakajima does not teach or suggest determining whether adding a "unique character string" is necessary or not.

Applicant contends that Claims 13 and 14, as well as newly added Claims 32 and 33, are neither anticipated by nor obvious over Nakajima. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 5, 11, 17, 23, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 5, 11, 17, 23, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0038350 issued to Lambert et al. ("Lambert"). All these rejected claims except for Claim 30 are herein canceled. Claim 30 is herein amended.

Applicant asserts that Claim 30, as herein amended, is patentable over Nakajima in view of Lambert. Claim 30 is directed to embodiments disclosed herein that involve a server redirecting a client to a second web page. Neither Nakajima nor Lambert teach or suggest transmitting a redirect message including a unique identifier with the address to the second web page. Applicant asserts that Claim 30, as well as newly added Claims 31, 33, and 34, are patentable over Nakajima and Lambert taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-25, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-25, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lambert. Applicant has amended Claims 13, 14, and 30 and canceled Claims 1-12, 15-25, and 28-29. Similar to the arguments concerning Claims 13, 14, and 30 made above with respect to Nakajima, Applicant asserts that Lambert does not teach or suggest 1) (with

respect to Claims 13, 14 and newly added Claims 32 and 33) “determining, at the client, whether there is content associated with the web page in the local cache” and *if there is content associated with the web page in the local cache*, inserting a unique identifier into the address;” or 2) (with respect to Claim 30 and newly added Claims 31, 33, and 34) transmitting a redirect message including a unique identifier with the address to the second web page.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representative would facilitate prosecution of this application in any way, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (508) 616-9660. If necessary, please apply any additional fees, or credit overpayments, to Deposit Account 50-3735.

Respectfully submitted,



Stanley K. Hill
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 37,548
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No. 1958.2010-000

Dated: October 27, 2006